



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

sidered as not having been without influence on the sensitive ear of Keats, it is the general tendency to expand words to the fullest extent, a tendency that finds, perhaps, its most striking example in the usage of the preterit or participial ending in *-ed* to complete the metre of a line. Mr. Swinburne, an excellent judge in such matters, has somewhere said that none but the critics have condemned this usage, and Keats evidently did not regard it as a defect, for it appears not only in his earlier poems, but also in some of his more finished productions. Thus, he has the rimes *unworried: head* (*End.* I, 75), *sped: garlanded* (*End.* I, 110), *bewildered: bed* (*End.* II, 93), *visited: ocean-bed* (*End.* III, 391), *ripened: led* (*End.* III, 707), *crescented: bed* (*End.* IV, 438), *tread: passioned* (*Lamia* I, 182), *said: vanished* (*Lamia* II, 307), *anguished: wed* (*Isabella*, st. VII), *casketed: spread* (*Isabella*, st. LIV), *shed: unwearied* (*Ode on a Grecian Urn*), *published: dead* (*Cap and Bells*, st. X). It is true that this usage of the ending *-ed* may be met with here and there throughout the range of modern English poetry. What forms with others the exception, however, is one of the characteristic features of Spenser's verse—I have counted ninety-five examples in the *Faerie Queene*—and occurs, as has been seen, not infrequently in Keats. Nevertheless, the system of measuring metre by the simple process of counting on finger and thumb the number of syllables in a given verse is liable to produce results so wild and fanciful that little significance can be attached to such a test. About all that can be said is, that Keats may have caught this mannerism from Spenser; it is impossible to prove that he did so.

The awakening of Keats's love for chivalry may be ascribed to the influence of the *Faerie Queene*. Chivalry, that feature of romanticism which finds its most perfect expression in the works of Scott, constitutes the frame on which several of Keats's poems are built. The *Induction to a Poem, Calidore*, the *Epistle to George Keats, On Receiving a Shell*, etc.,—these and other poems, especially in the volume of 1817, may be cited as striking examples of the youthful poet's effort to depict scenes from the days of chivalry. While it is not to be denied that other writers may have contributed to the development of the romantic spirit in Keats, the individual, as well as of the romantic move-

ment of the age, yet it is also clear that no influence was so powerful in fostering the romantic element in Keats's work as that of Spenser.

Such is a brief outline of a subject that might easily be pursued further. It is evident that the rich, bizarre effect of Keats's vocabulary is largely due to the exquisite taste with which he borrowed from the earlier English poets, but chiefly from Spenser, the word or phrase most appropriate to the situation. Then, too, Spenserian influence may, perhaps, be seen in his method of handling metre, and of course in his frequent usage of the Spenserian stanza, while a number of poems owe their very existence to the inspiration derived from the *Faerie Queene*. "There is something almost uncanny—like the visits of a spirit—about the recurrent appearances of Spenser in English literary history. It must be confessed that nowadays we do not greatly romp through 'The Faëry Queene.' There even runs a story that a certain professor of literature in an American college, being consulted about Spenser by one of his scholars, exclaimed impatiently, 'Oh, damn Spenser!' But it is worth while to have him in the literature, if only as a starter for young poets."⁶

WILLIAM A. READ.

Louisiana State University.

Pamela ABROAD.

Pamela is a moral novel which is sometimes very indecent; a sentimental story of a somewhat revolutionary character; and a badly told tale that holds our interest, spell-bound the eighteenth century, and was translated into at least seven languages. A young servant girl of talents and beauty inspires a passion in the breast of Mr. B., her master, resists his attempts on her honor, and finally leads him into marrying her. That is the plot in a sentence, and in it we see an old and much loved character, *la belle âme*, Spenser's Una, Milton's Lady, come again into favor with the revolt against seventeenth century rakishness, and here embodied in new form. But there is a startling variant to the conventional story of trium-

⁶ Beers, *English Romanticism in the Nineteenth Century*, p. 120.

phant virtue. Here virtue is a serving maid, and she marries her master; excellent morality perhaps, but very doubtful policy. In the past, except in the case of King Cophetua and the beggar maid, and such apocryphal tales, virtue had been made to be born gently if she were to be so rewarded. Finally here, as Professor Cross says, was a literary form which presented "life as it was, united with an ideal of life as it should be," the story of *la belle âme* told realistically; and this, if it was not the element which attracted the dramatists, was at least that which makes *Pamela* the first of the novels in point of time. So much for the original story, which aims, as the editor of the sixth edition quaintly says, "To paint Vice in its proper colours, to make it deservedly odious; and to set Virtue in its own amiable light, to make it look lovely."

The moral aspect of the story interested the English readers; this and the revolutionary suggestion the Continental. It was not very long before Pamela found her way abroad. The great dramatic age had passed in France as in England. In comedy Molière shunned the serious; he touched all sides of life, but never forgot to smile; he was moral without moralizing. The smaller men who followed found his range too wide and his attempt too high. Their work lost dignity, and comedy passed into the hands of those who would take some of her duties from the church and teach morality instead of wittily causing it. These moral writers, by stress of circumstances, fell into the use of the pathetic to enforce their ends. Destouches and Piron use it, though not designedly. After them La Chaussée, incapable of true tragedy or true comedy, saw that with an intermediate *genre* he could gratify a new taste, and in a measure supply that which the decadent tragedy no longer gave. While the elements have long existed, he is the inventor of the *comédie larmoyante*, which makes for realism; moves people to tears that are quite as satisfactory as smiles; is highly moral, and in keeping with the philosophical tendency of the age. The Pamela story tells itself well in such an atmosphere. Its morality is that of the new school, its sentimentality is easily made *larmoyante*. Moreover, Antoine François, Prévost d'Exilles had made in 1741 an excellent French translation, which was scarcely

less popular in France than the original in England. The new schools were not backward. They speedily availed themselves of this English material, and we may now take up Pamela as the central figure of a comedy of tears.

In 1733 La Chaussée set the new fashion in its career with "*La Fausse Antipathie*." His comedies followed thereafter in about two year intervals, to the great purging of Parisian tears. They were successful enough to inspire imitators, among whom seems to have been Boissy, a minor dramatist of the time. In May of 1743 he produced at the "Italiens," home of new ventures¹ and new ideas, his "*Pamela en France, ou la Vertu mieux éprouvée*." It was hissed, but its failure did not daunt La Chaussée, for in December of the same year he presented his *Pamela* to the more fastidious audience of the Comédie-Française. La Chaussée, said Voltaire, had made five acts without a single scene. Pamela lost her charm when she stepped upon his stage, for the borrower had taken one quality of Richardson's which had been better left alone, his incurable prolixity. "Billets rouges" were passed among the loyal *claqueurs*, instructions were given that "Que cela est beau!" might be called at the proper places, but to no avail. There was uproar in the theatre. Some wit, when the slowness became unendurable, cried, "Vous prendrez mon carrosse, afin d'aller plus vite," and La Chaussée retired his piece. So far the Pamela story was more adapted than adaptable. It had scored two failures, and now fell into the hands of the mockers, for the Italians satirized their own failure with that of the Comédie-Française in "*La Déroute de Pamela*," a burlesque by Dancourt. Yet it is interesting to note that two French dramatists in one year took up the theme of an Englishman. Perhaps it is significant of the growing part in literary France which England was to play; certainly it indicates a family likeness in the sentimental morality of the most popular English novel and the tearful pathos which the Parisian theatre-goer enjoyed.

Voltaire succeeded in professing an active dislike for the *comédie larmoyante*, and acknowledging that he had been won over to its principles all in the same preface. This remarkable achieve-

¹ Cf. Bernardin: *La Comédie des Italiens*.

ment may be seen in any edition of *Nanine*, where the reader will find him first damning the new school, then pleading for a middle ground between comedy and tragedy. Tears followed by laughter are natural to the human race, therefore the comedy of tenderness and tears is legitimate so long as it never forgets that it must ultimately provoke laughter. "*Nanine*" is, professedly, such a comedy. The idea and much of the plot are Richardson's, the working out is in some respects Voltaire's, as is the credit for the whole performance so far as any acknowledgment of debt is concerned. Mr. B. becomes Le Conte D'Olban, gaining a much milder disposition with the title. The bad qualities of Lady Davers are transferred to La Baronne de L'Orme, to whom the Count is half-bound by a pre-contract of marriage. Pamela, less strenuously virtuous, is Nanine; Andrews is Phillipe Hombert, an old soldier. The Count wishes to marry Nanine almost from the first. The baroness is plotting to avert the match. A convent, a threatened marriage with the gardener, finally a fearful jealousy when all is going well, whereby a letter to Hombert, father of Nanine, is supposed to be to a rival, all delay the *dénouement*, which, of course, is a marriage with the count. So ends this "bagatelle" as Voltaire called it; bourgeois Richardson dressed in gentlefolk's clothes.

La Chaussée's *Pamela* was designed to draw an almost constant patter of tears from the audience. Voltaire never forgets that he is a wit; yet the *larmoyante* quality is not lacking in this little piece. Nanine, amid laments, leaves the house of her jealous master in a scene which is quite charmingly pathetic. But the doldrums of the count when Nanine will not yield are not so affecting and by no means so absurd as the rapid pining away of La Chaussée's unfortunate Milord B. Both plays are highly moral; indeed the gentleman just mentioned ends the comedy by declaring how delighted he is to serve himself by recompensing virtue. But it is the attitude towards the revolutionary nature of the plot that is perhaps of the greatest interest, for nothing will better indicate the state of the public mind on such questions than the opinions which their plaudit-seeking dramatists allow themselves. La Chaussée was fortunate. He was regarded merely as the adapter of a well-

known English story, which, being English, might very naturally contain something heretical according to Continental ideas. Yet even he softens situations as much as possible. In the first place the dangerous opening chapters, where Pamela is too obviously the menial, find no place in his drama. Pamela comes of humble stock, her parents are poor, but she neither acts nor speaks like a servant, and Madame Andrews, who attempts to save her daughter's honor, is by no means a peasant. At the end Pamela consents to sully the honor of Milord by marrying him, and Miledi Davers is willing to lower hers by permitting it, only as a heroic life-saving expedient. Milord, in one short scene, has passed from reasonable health into a terrible decline, and now is coming perhaps to his last moment, all because he cannot have this girl. Surely the staunchest of conservatives would have let him have his will under such circumstances, especially when five minutes of happiness will restore him to complete strength again. And thus La Chaussée tacitly acknowledges the social difficulties of his subject, without feeling himself much hampered thereby.

Matters were different with Voltaire. In the first place he said nothing whatsoever about Richardson's connection with his affair, and therefore took all the responsibility upon himself. Then, too, his story was somewhat different, and in 1749, when *Nanine* appeared, it had been eight years since the first vogue of *Pamela*, long enough to dim the impression of the English story in most minds. It may be that Voltaire, more keenly alive to all questions of philosophy, saw further into the implications of that course of action which Richardson allowed his characters. At all events he makes it sufficiently evident that he considers Richardson somewhat revolutionary. His temperings, and softenings, and sugarings, only confirm the impression made by the significant couplet at the end. Be happy and all the rest, says the old Marquise D'Olban at the final betrothal, but let this not be made a precedent. Phillipe Hombert the father of Nanine is no peasant; that would never do. He is a peasant in appearance for dramatic effect, but in reality a soldier whose ungrateful state has failed to reward his noble service in the wars. Goldoni, as will be seen, makes this father noble, La Chaussée is ambiguous, Voltaire

chooses a middle course, and thus somewhat exalts the first state of his Pamela to soothe conservative feelings. Indeed Nanine is treated rather as a companion to the old lady than as a servant. In an illustration to one old edition she appears in finery not less gorgeous than the elaborate costume of the Baroness. Her apparel is even made a reproach to her in the play. Then, in Act 1, scene 7, the count speaks. Tell me frankly, he says, what effect has this English book had upon you? The author of this English book pretends, as Nanine has said in an earlier passage, that all men are born brothers, all born equal. Nanine replies,

"Il ne m'a point du tout persuadée;
Plus que jamais, monsieur, j'ai dans l'idée
Qu'il est des cœurs si grand, si généreux,
Que tout le reste est bien vil auprès d'eux."

This seems to be a clever method of begging the question. *Nanine* is interesting apart from the light it throws upon the relation of Richardson's work to the eighteenth century. It is quite the best play made from the Pamela material. Tears trickle very easily; letters are misunderstood as they never would be anywhere except on the stage, but it goes. It did not have to borrow a "carrosse" to make it travel faster.

It is not improbable that the original English edition of Pamela was known in Italy, for the Italians of the early eighteenth century were great admirers of things English. Carlo Goldoni was always looking for new material for his unending string of comedies. Through his compatriots of the Italians he was possibly familiar with the work of Boissy and La Chaussée, but it was unquestionably *Nanine*, and its source in Prévost, that stood sponsors for his comedy of *Pamela Fanciulla*, sometimes called *Pamela Nubile*. Indeed he speaks of "the romance of Pamela the delight of the Italians"² and tells how he was urged by his friends to base a comedy upon it. In the spring of 1750 this interesting comedy was put upon the stage at Mantua, introducing "la bella inglese Pamela" to the Italian theatre-goer.

In the collected editions of this play is a preface as amusing as it is significant of the character of the story regarded from an Italian standpoint. Beneath the heading, "The author to

the reader," Goldoni very frankly confesses his debt, saying that he who knows the original may see in what degree his own invention has had play. But the original is not altogether to be admired. Richardson must be severely censured for lack of proper decorum. Virtue itself is pleasing enough, but even virtue, when of mean degree, must not be allowed to stain by marriage the blood of a Cavaliere. "O the English author, according to me," says Goldoni plaintively, "ought not to dispute such an article, or he ought to settle it with more decorum for his nation." Now virtue and morality were beginning to be so fashionable in Italy, as well as in more northern countries, that Goldoni feels that perhaps he has gone too far. And he would hesitate before disagreeing with the English. According to the principles of nature, he says, virtue may be preferable to nobility and riches, but, he continues naïvely, on the stage he must show that most commonly approved, he must be pardoned for exhibiting the custom most praised. He could have changed his argument, or his scene, as Voltaire in *Nanine*, but no, he is too much pleased with the beautiful English characters. "It is my delight," writes this flatterer, "to penetrate as far as I am able into the maxims and the customs of this illustrious nation." And the defence of the moral comedy with which he ends this frank foreword might have been written by Steele himself. His denial that his play is not true comedy is borrowed from Voltaire.

Goldoni's problem was not easy. He had not only to reduce an action of great range to the narrow limits of a play, but also to supply an ending which would be cheerful without offending Italian decorum. As the preface indicates, he set about it manfully. Mr. B. becomes Milord Bonfil, gains morality and loses strength. Richardson's Mr. B. was plainly too brutal for the Frenchmen and the Italian, but the more generous characters which they present are worthy of no greater respect. Bonfil, soon made to repent of his wicked designs by a page and a quarter of truly Pamelian argument, falls into a pitiable vacillation between will and will not, between marriage and parting, sufficient, indeed, to carry on the plot for nearly all of three acts. Pamela is our occasionally sweet, more usually priggish, Pamela still, but Italian-

² *Memoirs*, p. 167.

ated, inasmuch as her love for her master is there from the start. Miledi Davre is easily recognized, though Italianate, too, for instead of boxing Pamela's ears at the proper place she threatens to kill her. Milord Artur is the mouthpiece of decorum throughout the play. Il Cavaliere Ernold is Lord Jackey, given a broader sphere. In Goldoni he has traveled, and that is his humor. The plot progresses along the general lines of the English story until the complication is well developed. Bonfil is madly in love with Pamela, yet is deterred from marriage by Artur's reproaches, and by his own sense of decorum. He tries the effect of an absence treatment, only to be overcome by an "orribile svenimento," which brings him home again to the source of his physical well-being. Things look very bad, either for Italian decorum or Italian tear ducts, when the ingenious author comes to the rescue. Andreuve, the father of Pamela, steps upon the stage. He is the peasant of Richardson in appearance and in manners, but wait and see. At the proper moment, when all seems lost for unhappy Pamela and despairing Bonfil, this venerable *deux ex machina* confesses that, rough as he may be externally, his blood is of the proper composition for the purging of Italian punctilio. Indeed he is no other than Count Auspigh, a Scotch rebel, it seems, who, flying to the mountains some thirty years back, had settled humbly incognito in England when the persecution ended. He throws himself upon the mercy of the delighted Bonfil, who promises to gain a pardon, and then marries Pamela, after making her weep a bit by telling her that he is engaged to the Countess Auspigh. So the play ends with "Virtue gloriously triumphant."

That Goldoni must have had a first hand acquaintance with Richardson's *Pamela*, either in French or in English, is made very evident by a perusal of the play; that he knew *Nanine* seems to be as certain, not only on account of the reference in the preface, but for internal reasons as well. The characters have a close family resemblance. The struggle between decorum and inclination is identical in the two comedies. Goldoni's advice for solving the marriage problem is but an amplification of Voltaire's to fit a more difficult case; for the Italian took the harder part in choosing to keep true to Richardson, and yet accord with

native tastes. And there are other close resemblances. The Italian play is witty, occasionally excellent, but in structure defective. It is not so good a play as *Nanine*. That Goldoni thought his tale was so radical as to need handling with gloves almost every scene shows. That he thought it material for a *comédie larmoyante* may be judged by the prevalence of tears throughout, and still better by comparison with his new Pamela play which followed.

For Goldoni was not done with "la bella inglese Pamela." At Carnival time in Rome, in the year 1760, he presented *Pamela Maritata* at the Teatro Capranica. If Goldoni read the second part of Pamela he found no more satisfaction in it than the reader of to-day. I am inclined to think that he did not. At all events the action in this second piece is built upon circumstances which Goldoni himself introduced into the story, and the one new character, "Monsieur Majer, Ministro della Segreteria di Stato," is quite obviously of Italian origin. What little action there is in Richardson's continued story arises from the affection for Mr. B. engendered in the breast of the nun at the masquerade, and the subsequent intrigue. The Italian plot, too, is founded upon jealousy, but, in keeping with national traits, the jealousy of a husband who unjustly suspects his wife. There is no other resemblance between the two.

This very amusing little play has very little to do with the history of the Pamela story. As a comedy it is much nearer to the conventional Goldoni type than *Pamela Fanciulla*. This one is a moral comedy only in so far as morality triumphs at the end; and *larmoyante* only inasmuch as innocence is most of the time in distress. It is only slightly moralizing, perhaps because of the welcome escape from Richardson, and it was probably on account of the absence of a social problem that the author constructed a better play for Pamela than in his first attempt.

Pietro Chiari, better known as l'abbate Chiari, was a comedy writer of the gay days of Venice, Goldoni's bitter rival, and the beaten dog in a merry war that raged between the two for many years. L'abbate Chiari had a system of retaliation in this contest which very much resembled the old trick of capping verses. Goldoni wrote his *Moliere*

and gained applause; Chiari promptly took up the story where he had left it, with his *Moliere marito geloso* as a result. He gave him *Filosofo veneziano* for his *Filosofo inglese*, and, by a correspondent alchemy, *Pamela maritata* for the *Pamela nubile*, of which I have been speaking. The text of this play of Chiari seems not to be had here; the plot, as it is given in *Un rivale del Goldoni* of Gianfrancesco Sommi Picenardi, makes one thing very clear; it is to jealousy of Goldoni, not love of Richardson, that we must give credit for another Pamela play. The material is simply that which had been used before worked up in new form, with a leaven of novel incident which does not come from Richardson. Indeed I am inclined to think, from a certain slight similarity in the plot of the two, that Goldoni's second Pamela comedy, *Pamela maritata*, drew much more inspiration from this play of the same name than from the second part of the English *Pamela*. Chiari translated *Tom Jones* and was therefore in all probability familiar with Prévost's Richardson. He does not seem to have made much use of his knowledge, unless indeed we may believe Picenardi, who says that his characters are more faithful to their originals in Richardson. For this merit he particularly commends Chiari's Bonfil, a truly English character, who, in the chief scene of the play, requests Pamela to confess her guilt or watch him cut the throat of their only child. He is rude and impetuous, says Picenardi, precisely as in the English romance.

The *Pamela Fanciulla* of Goldoni was translated into English in 1756, and thus came back to her own, where, indeed, a Pamela play by James Dance preceded. The Italian play was also translated into French, Spanish, Portuguese, German and modern Greek, a range of European interest which seems to point as much to the nature of the story as to the popularity of Goldoni, for *Pamela maritata*, while often translated, went by no means so far. Both plays found their way into opera. Italian authorities speak of the influence of the Pamela story upon succeeding dramatists of the "commedia lagrimosa" school, especially Giovanni Greppi. De Camerra, too, the Italian La Chaussée, must have drawn inspiration here as well as from *Clarissa Harlowe*, where he found the material for four

plays. These were men of the moral-sentimental movement, and in that change of taste Pamela seems to have been as much of a factor here as in France.

The French, probably, were quite familiar with Richardson in Revolutionary times, therefore another version of equality-breathing Pamela is not surprising. That it should have been put upon the stage in the midst of the Reign of Terror is excellent evidence of the attitude of its century towards the story. The author, François de Neufchâteau, had a checkered career. Befriended by Voltaire at an early age, he experimented largely in the field of letters, his endeavors reaching all the way from the theatre to a translation of *Orlando Furioso*, upon which he spent years of labor, only to lose the manuscript in the wreck of his vessel, homeward bound from the West Indies. It will be seen from the last item of information that Italian was a familiar tongue for him. In 1791 he read at the Lyceum a comedy entitled "*Pamela, empruntée au célèbre roman de Richardson*."

By the summer of 1793 the Girondists had been downed, conservatism was suppressed, and the Committee of Public Safety was ruling with a despotism of terror. The coalition threatened from without. Violence held sway within. France was nearly ready for a reaction from her debauch of blood, and this the men at the helm knew and feared. It was at such an electric time, on the first of August 1793, that *Pamela* was produced at the Comédie-Française. It ran eight nights with great applause. Then came a warning from the Committee of Public Safety. *Pamela* was reactionary; that she should prove to be the daughter of a count did not please the Revolutionists. The play was interdicted on the 24th of August, withdrawn, Pamela made a commoner throughout the play, and replaced on the 2d of September. Its new career was a short one. On this night at the repetition of the lines,

"Ah! les persécuteurs sont les seuls condamnables,
Et les plus tolérants sont les plus raisonnables!"

a patriot cried, "Point de tolérance politique! c'est un crime!" Confusion followed and the man was ejected. This was too much; by order of the National Convention, through the instigation of Barrère, the actors and the author were thrown

into prison, and the Comédie-Française, for the first time in its history, was closed.

Professor Masi, in his *Storia del teatro italiano*, would have it that the objection lay in the nobility of Pamela, which, rather than her virtue, was rewarded. This is only a half-truth, for in the revision Pamela's nobility was carefully disposed of. Barrère, in his report to the committee, praised the ending of *Nanine*, in which the count marries the low born girl; she is scarcely a servant there. Undoubtedly this conclusion would better accord with the taste of the French radicals than would the climax in Neufchâteau, for Voltaire makes her father an unrewarded soldier, while Neufchâteau raises him to the rank of captain. But he was much too wise to ennoble his Pamela, as Signor Masi might have discovered. Indeed the old Captain Auspigh is careful to say that he is not of noble blood.

This last name hints at a fact which the editions of the play would never betray, although one biographer comes near to it. Neufchâteau's *Pamela* is as direct a translation from Goldoni's *Pamela Fanciulla* as the nature of the times and theme would permit. The author, in an open letter when his piece was suppressed, says that the debasing of Pamela has destroyed another comedy which he was going to imitate from Goldoni's *Pamela maritata*. But this is not an imitation; it is a direct translation, cut somewhat, patched with a few sentiments to please Republican ears, and ended by a device which is a compromise between Goldoni and Voltaire. Auspigh, instead of solving all difficulties by declaring his nobility, proves merely to be an old captain who has saved the life of Bonfil's father, and that is the extent of the novelty in the plot, novelty introduced, it will be noticed, only at the necessary revision of the piece.

Careful translation is continued almost throughout the piece, with occasional omissions, and now and then an insertion for a purpose. For instance, Act 1, scene 6 in the Italian closes with a vehement denunciation and reproach by Pamela, after which Bonfil paces up and down, moved, but saying nothing. In the French arrangement the author has added a soliloquy of a line or two:

"Faut il qu'entre

Elle et moi l'orgueil de ma naissance

Elève un préjugé dont la raison s'offense?"

Which is very plainly a sop to the Republicans. Indeed there is little change and no real invention until the last act, in the scene where Joseph Andrews (evidently a reminiscence of Fielding) is made to confess that he is really a captain Auspigh. Here the rebellion of the old man is specialized and shown to have been the attempt of the Pretender against William, whereby religion and not hatred of a king becomes the root of Auspigh's disaffection. In 1793 it would never do to have the old man confess sorrow for a mere revolt against a king. A few such baitings for the crowd constitute Neufchâteau's sole claim to the play, unless, by a process similar to the transference of honor to Pope from Donne, he gains Goldoni's laurels because he versified his play.

Thus the *Pamela* of Neufchâteau is the *Pamela fanciulla* of Goldoni, translated, cut slightly, with an ending somewhat altered, and certain lines of political bearing added without effect upon the structure of the play, but with a purpose so transparent that when Neufchâteau wrote "Le règne des bourreaux est passé, Dieu merci" the Committee of Public Safety who, like most defeated candidates, were not willing to admit the evidence of the returns, could understand and punish the audacity of the author. Neufchâteau and the actors were not long in prison,³ and on the 6th of Thermidor of the Year Three (July 25, 1794) *Pamela* was presented again.

This, so far as I have been able to discover, was the last appearance of Pamela upon the stage in a new rendering. Her influence and the heroines who trace back to her as a literary ancestress must be left out of this reckoning, but it was great and they were numerous. Her character and her story must be regarded as a product and as an impetus in the half moral, half sentimental wave which swept over Europe in the eighteenth century, making for morality in England, and in Italy and in France coloring with human interest the formal productions of the decadent classic school, and bringing new life to the comedy. In no one of these countries did this alteration result in a great dramatic form. The English comedies were dull, the French usually sentimental and weak, the Italian eventually did much to destroy the effect of Goldoni's work, which, in the main,

³ See A. Pougin, *La Comédie-Française et la Révolution*.

encouraged a clever, though superficial comedy. But in this widespread fashion may be found some of the roots of Romanticism, and therefore of the modern comedy, which owes so much to its Romantic source. Pamela is no longer Revolutionary, nor surprisingly moral, but there are many comedies to-day which approximate the effect of her story, more, perhaps, than some lovers of true wit desire.

HENRY SEIDEL CANBY.

Yale University.

FRENCH DICTIONARIES.

Cassell's New French Dictionary. Pp. 596-616. 7 x 4 inches. D. Appleton & Company, 1903.
James & Molé's New French Dictionary. Pp. 663-564. 7 x 4 inches. Macmillan, 1903.

The dictionary maker seems to be abroad. Edgren's excellent book was published only a few years ago and the two mentioned above have just appeared in revised form, while still others are announced as in preparation. This activity deserves commendation, although it is a misfortune that some one—especially an American—does not undertake the revision of some of these books and make a dictionary that is really up to date; ranking in this respect with the school edition of Sachs-Villatte, for example. We insist on this point that it should be an American scholar and teacher, because both of the above books were made in England and what may be a good definition in England is not necessarily a good definition with us. For example, both of these books define "souquenille," *smock-frock*. Now an English child may know very well what a smock-frock is, but certainly to most of our students this definition is meaningless.

Again, Cassell defines the railroad term "aiguille," *point*, which is intelligible to an Englishman but we should say *switch*. It is only fair to say that in James & Molé, as well as in Edgren, the word is adequately defined.

The Cassell dictionary follows the plan of pronouncing exceptional words only, while in James & Molé all words are pronounced, thus taking up much space that might more profitably have been devoted to other matters. Even such elementary

words as *il* and *elle* are respelt for pronunciation; concerning which it may be said that students who need help in such cases have no rights that dictionary makers are bound to respect.

Cassell's dictionary has the serious defect of defining things that need no definition and, on the other hand, of giving definitions that do not define. Of the first defect examples may be found under almost any word that has several significations. Take for example, "bras." Why define the phrase "être blessé au bras" as *wounded in the arm*? Could it possibly mean anything else? Also: "il a le bras en écharpe," "recevoir quelqu'un à bras ouverts," or "un bras de mer." The same defect is found in James & Molé but to a less degree, the definitions there being generally briefer. If economy of space was a consideration, a large proportion of the compounds under *sous* as well as elsewhere might have been omitted. It is doubtful whether any one will ever look under *sous* for such words as *sous-bibliothécaire* and *sous-précepteur*. Of definitions that do not define *pan coupé* may serve as an example, "et crimine ab uno disce omnes." This is defined by Cassell as "cant," which is precisely as good as no definition at all. It may be added that this phrase is entirely lacking in James & Molé. By omitting useless matter of the kind mentioned above much space might have been saved for the introduction of many new words and definitions that would have been useful. While it could not be expected that dictionaries should keep up with the vocabulary of Pierre Loti or Zola there surely is no good reason why a dictionary which pretends to be "up to date in all respects" (the prospectus of Cassell has precisely these words) should not record all the words found in the principal works of such standard writers as Balzac, Daudet, Flaubert, and Hugo. "Tressauter" occurs in *Le Petit Chose* and "hébètement" in *Les Misérables*, but these words are lacking in both of the above-mentioned dictionaries, as well as in Edgren. One would also look in vain in any of these dictionaries for an explanation of the common phrase "pas gymnastique." "Ascenseur" is found in Cassell but not in James & Molé, although if one should want to know what to call the mechanism that replaces the stairs in most modern large buildings he would look in vain under "elevator" in all the diction-